

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: H/24/97921

Site Address: CORONA, 37 UPPER NORTHAM ROAD, HEDGE END,
SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 4EA

Case Officer: Rachael Morris

Description: Raising of the roof and eaves level to form a first-floor extension and habitable rooms to a loft space, to include an internal annexe to the ground floor.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Adjacent to Local Nature Reserve, SINC and open space • Tree Preservations Order(s) • Within the urban edge		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Z/26175/000/00 - lounge/kitchen extension – Aug 1982 • Z/26175/002/00 - Outline: Construction Of 6 Semi-Detached Dwellings with New Vehicular Access Following Demolition of Existing Dwelling – Refuse - Feb 2002 • Z/26175/003/00 - Outline: Construction Of 4 Semi-Detached Dwellings And 1 No. Detached Dwelling with New Vehicular Access Following Demolition of Existing Dwelling – Refuse - Oct 2002 • F/18/84257 - Demolition of existing bungalow and replacement with a new chalet bungalow property – Dismissed at appeal – July 2019 • F/21/89691 - Construction of 1no. detached two-storey dwelling incorporating a car port following demolition of existing bungalow – Refuse – Aug 2023		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	9 Garrat Close. Support. I fully support this proposal. I used to live in a property in Thistle Road and know this location well. The family have reached out to the friends of the nearby Local Nature Reserve to help preserve its future, and I understand that they have even engaged with the Operations Manager at the Town Council. 9 Lower St Helens Road. Comment. I have known the family at 37 Upper Northam Road for over 40 years, and just wanted to voice my support for this application, that will enable my long-term friend to remain independent.		
Town Council:	No Objection.		
Ecology:	This site is adjacent to Bridget Mary Gardens, which is part of the Wildern Nature Park Local Nature Reserve. It is located in an amber great crested newt impact risk zone, and there are records of slow worms and common lizards in the area. There are records of bats, notable invertebrates, and lesser spearwort (a notable plant) nearby. I have reviewed the Preliminary Roost Assessment report by Vesper Conservation and Ecology Ltd (June 2024). The building has been assessed to have negligible bat roost potential. A precautionary working method will be required. Biodiversity enhancements will be required in accord with Local Plan policy DM11 - a bat brick and a swift brick may be appropriate for this building.		
Tree Officer:	No objection subject to a condition.		

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 12/04/2024 and 26/05/2021		

Policy:

National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance

Development Plan:

The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1 and S2; and Development Management policies DM1, DM11 and DM14.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals (HEWEB 25).

Assessment:

The development is considered acceptable and complies with policies DM1, DM11 and DM14 from the 2016-2036 local plan, in that:

Principle

- The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable.
- Two-storey dwellings and other chalet type dwellings are noted to be within the locality of Upper Northam Road.
- The site also sits adjacent to a path that leads to Bridget Mary Garden SINC. Therefore, a building in this plot must not detract from this public open space and allow views down to the deciduous woodland that offers public amenity.
- As set out in policy DM1, all new development should not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible should enhance: residential amenities of both new and existing residents; the character and appearance of urban areas; biodiversity; take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be compatible with adjoining uses and be well integrated with these in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views; not involve the loss of or damage to trees, woodlands, hedgerows, ponds, priority habitats or other landscape features of value to the character of the area; include a landscape scheme covering the design and layout of external space; protect and enhance public rights of way; provide satisfactory management arrangements for all landscape, green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement; incorporate provision for people with disabilities and create accessible communities that cater for all.
- The Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area Appraisal (HEWEB 25) raises limited information, which is mainly based on the retention of vegetation and grass verges and to mitigate the effects of heavy vehicular traffic. However, it does mention the retention of building lines in which this proposal does not bring the property forward of this established building line.

Design and layout

- The design of the raised roof and eaves to form a first-floor extension is suited to the host dwelling in terms of its form, scale and appearance.
- The development would not be an overdevelopment of the site, would retain sufficient amenity space and meet parking standards. The proposal includes 4.no bedrooms to the first floor loft space of the proposal with the addition of an annexe bedroom to the ground floor. As such, the proposal would require 3.no off-highway parking spaces, in accordance with the Residential Parking Standards SPD for properties with 4+ bedrooms, which can be provided to the front drive.
- The proposed design respects the existing character of the existing dwelling. The existing hipped roof design is altered to a more barn-hip design but from the front has a similar appearance. In addition, the two front bay windows are retained and carried through to this re-design.

- The proposed height increase would be approx. 0.5m and would match the neighbouring property's ridge height (no.35 Upper Northam Road). The proposed eaves would also increase in height by approx. 0.5m which does result in a higher level than the neighbouring property. However, this property does have a different design and as such it is not expected that these dwellings would match in appearance.
- The proposal includes the introduction of two small gables to the bay windows and a rear gable which are new features to the dwelling. The gables to the front are minor and would also be similar to those seen at the neighbour (no.35). Although the larger gable is to the rear, it would still be seen from the adjacent footpath to the nature reserve which is an important consideration as it would be seen by members of the public. However, as above, there is also a gable to the rear of the neighbouring property (no.35) and so would have a similar character.
- The appeal in 2019 (F/18/84257) noted that "It would not necessarily be harmful to increase the scale of the existing building on the plot and given the reasonable mix of styles in the area a well-designed contemporary replacement building could be successful. However, other buildings in the area incorporate simple built elements, such as full hips and complete bays with gables facing the road." It is considered this design respects this comment and represents the type of design that the Inspector sought.
- The proposal will include external materials with brickwork and plain clay roof tiles to match the existing. In addition, the windows are proposed as aluminium and some accent composite cladding in a khaki brown wood effect is shown to the front and rear gables which would suit the sylvan nature of the dwelling's setting.
- The internal annexe would provide a bedroom, kitchenette and bathroom with a ramped access to the side and access to the garden from rear patio doors. Although separate entrances are not encouraged for annexes, this entrance would provide the needed ramped access for an elderly relative and provide direct access for carers. In addition, the rear doors would lead onto the main garden which is not shown as sub-divided. The internal annexe is modest, does rely on the main dwelling for day-to-day activities and as such is considered acceptable. The annexe will be conditioned to be used in conjunction with the existing dwelling or by a dependent relative of the occupiers of the existing dwelling and shall not be sold off, occupied or used as an independent unit of accommodation.
- Overall, the application is considered to accord with policy DM1 of the local plan (2016-2036).

Residential amenity

- The proposed first floor windows on the east elevation are on plan as obscure glazed from above 1.7m from floor level. These are habitable rooms (bedrooms) and so although it is not ideal that there are elements of obscure glazing, due to the window design that extends up to the roof, there will still be an element of outlook available to the occupants of the rooms. This level of obscurity will be conditioned.
- There are no neighbours to the immediate rear or west side elevation and the front elevation is separated by the road and looks to the public realm where overlooking is more accepted and expected.
- The development accords with guidance set out in the 'Quality Places' SPD in that there will be no unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook.

Other material considerations

- There will be no adverse impact upon trees or other natural features worthy of retention.
- There are no likely significant impacts on the SPA.

- This bungalow appears to not be habitable and so extensions to assist its re-habitation would benefit the character of the area and would accord with key principles within the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The required precautionary working statement will be conditioned as part of the approval.
- In order to accord with policy DM11, a biodiversity enhancement will be required which will be conditioned as a bat brick and a swift brick.

Climate Change:

In July 2019, the Council declared a Climate Change and Environmental Emergency. In doing so it agreed, among other things, to: (a) put in place measures to ensure the Council's own operations and functions achieve carbon neutrality by 2025; (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030; (c) ensure that the Council's procurement policy recognises carbon neutrality as one of its primary considerations; and (d) recognise the urgency of action to mitigate and adapt to climate change in every decision taken by the Council. This is underpinned by the Climate and Environment Emergency Strategy 2020–2030 and the supporting Climate and Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.

The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF, development plan and adopted local plan policy do not set this as a specific target, but it is a material consideration to be considered alongside all other material considerations. In any case addressing climate change is a core part of the NPPF and local plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the adopted local plan, as is an assessment of climate impacts.

Equalities Implications:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:

- A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups. It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications

Conclusion:

Recommendation:	PERMIT ☒	REFUSE ☐
-----------------	---	--

Comments ...
